UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CIVIL ACTION NO 16-MD-2738 (FLW) (LHG)

IN RE JOHNSON & JOHNSON : TRANSCRIPT OF
POWDER PRODUCTS MARKETING, : STATUS CONFERENCE : APRIL 29, 2019 SALES PRACTICES.

CLARKSON S. FISHER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE 402 EAST STATE STREET, TRENTON, NJ 08608

B E F O R E: THE HONORABLE FREDA L. WOLFSON, USDJ

APPEARANCES:

BEASLEY ALLEN, ESQUIRES

BY: P. LEIGH O'DELL, ESQUIRE (ALABAMA)

-and-

ASHCRAFT & GEREL, ESQUIRES

BY: MICHELLE A. PARFITT, ESQUIRE (VIRGINIA)

-and-

LEVIN PAPANTONIO, ESQUIRES

BY: CHRISTOPHER V. TISI, ESQUIRE (FLORIDA)

-and-

MOTLEY RICE, ESQUIRES

BY: DANIEL R. LAPINSKI, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)

-and-

LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN, ESQUIRES

BY: LAURENCE S. BERMAN, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA)

MICHAEL M. WEINKOWITZ, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA)

(Continued.)

VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, RPR, CRR, CCR OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER (609) 588-9516

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

GOLOMB & HONIK, ESQUIRES
BY: RICHARD M. GOLOMB, ESQUIRE (PENNSYLVANIA)
On behalf of Plaintiffs Steering Committee

DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH, ESQUIRES
BY: SUSAN M. SHARKO, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)
JULIE L. TERSIGNI ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)
-and-

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM, ESQUIRES
BY: JOHN H. BEISNER, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

PROSKAUER ROSE, ESQUIRES

BY: BART H. WILLIAMS, ESQUIRE (CALIFORNIA)

LEE M. POPKIN, ESQUIRE (NEW YORK)

On behalf of Defendant Johnson & Johnson

SEYFARRTH & SHAW, ESQUIRES

BY: THOMAS L. LOCKE, ESQUIRE (WASHINGTON D.C.)

-andBARRY, McTIERNAN & WEDINGER, ESQUIRES
BY: JENNIFER N. CHEONG, ESQUIRE (NEW JERSEY)
On Behalf of Defendant Personal Care Products Council (PCPC)

TUCKER ELLIS, ESQUIRES
BY: CAROLINE M. TINSLEY, ESQUIRE (MISSOURI)
On behalf of Defendants PTI Union, LLC and PTI
Royston, LLC

CERTIFICATE

PURSUANT TO TITLE 28, U.S.C., SECTION 753, THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPT IS CERTIFIED TO BE AN ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

S/Vincent Russoniello
VINCENT RUSSONIELLO, CCR
OFFICIAL U.S. COURT REPORTER

3

```
4
1
             (In open court.)
 2
 3
            THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Thank you.
 4
 5
            I'll have the appearances.
            MS. PARFITT: Michelle Parfitt for the
 6
7
    plaintiffs.
8
            MS. O'DELL: Good morning, your Honor.
            Leigh O'Dell for the plaintiffs.
 9
            MR. TISI: Good morning, your Honor.
10
11
            Chris Tisi for the plaintiffs.
12
            MR. LAPINSKI: Good morning, your Honor.
13
            Dan Lapinski for the plaintiffs.
14
            MR. WEINKOWITZ: Good morning, your Honor.
15
            Mike Weinkowitz for the plaintiffs.
            MR. GOLOMB: Richard Golomb for the
16
17
    plaintiffs.
18
            MR. BERMAN: And Laurence Berman for the
19
    plaintiffs.
20
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. Ms. Sharko.
21
            MS. SHARKO: Susan Sharko for the J&J
2.2
    defendants, and I'm very happy to say that Julie
23
    Tersigni is back with us today.
2.4
            JUDGE WOLFSON: We're happy, too.
25
            MS. SHARKO: We also have Bart Williams from
```

```
5
    the Proskauer firm. I mentioned him a while back as
1
 2
    one of the lawyers who is working with us on the
 3
    Daubert issues.
            MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Good morning.
            MR. BEISNER: Good morning, your Honor.
 6
 7
            John Beisner on behalf of the J&J defendants
8
    as well.
 9
            MR. LOCKE: Good morning, your Honor.
            Tom Locke for the Personal Care Products
10
11
    Council.
12
            MS. TINSLEY: Good morning, your Honor.
            Caroline Tinsley for PTI Union and PTI
13
14
    Royston.
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Thank you.
16
            By the way, before I begin, was there any
17
    decision by the Delaware court on the venue motion?
18
            MS. O'DELL: Not at this point, your Honor.
    It's been filed. I understand that oppositions will
19
    be due on May the 9th and we expect consideration of
20
21
    that motion thereafter.
2.2
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. I don't know why Judge
    Ferguson thought there was something coming last week.
23
24
    But obviously briefing hasn't been completed. So that
25
    was not accurate.
```

2.2

While I brought that up, in any event, let me just turn to that for a moment, about what's been going on in that connection.

I know Ms. Sharko had contacted our chambers about the appropriate way of removing to our court, and there were about nine cases I guess that had ended up in Camden because they came out of Atlantic County and that would have been the venue for it.

We had directed all of that to come up to Trenton. So they have been transferred to Trenton so there is just one location.

Also, I had an opportunity to confer with Judge Ferguson, who is our Chief of the Bankruptcy Court, and consistent with our standing order here in New Jersey, which is that all the matters are referred automatically to the bankruptcy court. It would not get filed with us directly first. It would get filed in the bankruptcy court.

That's what we told you, if you are going to remove, to remove there and it would be handled there. So my understanding is there were a number of removals that were done last week to the bankruptcy court. Is that correct?

MS. SHARKO: Yes.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Have they been assigned to a

JUDGE WOLFSON: They are going to have the same issue involved. You can contact Judge Ferguson's chambers since apparently they are being assigned to her and get direction from her on that. I would think it makes sense, but I'm not calling the shot on that one.

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, my understanding is that Article 3 judges actually rule on the motion to remand in those instances.

Will Judge Ferguson be issuing a recommendation to your Honor and then you consider that, or have you given thought to the procedural sort of steps?

JUDGE WOLFSON: We haven't because it certainly was her indication that she would be ruling on it. She didn't indicate whether it was going to be done by an R and R or as an actual decision. So we'll have to see.

Now, you're basing that on what, that it has to be an Article 3 judge, the remand?

MS. O'DELL: I confess that bankruptcy is new law to me. So just in terms of the research that I have done and others that practice in this area, that the district judges are ruling on the jurisdictional issues.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay.

2.2

MS. O'DELL: I just offer that as what we have been told. There are a number of jurisdictions like the District of New Jersey where motions automatically go to the bankruptcy court, and I understand they are being transferred, but we'll be in touch with Judge Ferguson.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Be in touch with Judge

Ferguson, and I'll consult with her too once we know what's going on. So that's with all of those cases.

Now, let's turn to where we are on your status letter.

As you know, Judge Pisano did issue a decision with regard to the communications with the experts in Health Canada. You saw his letter of April 19th. I guess he was waiting for confirmation from plaintiffs' counsel as to how he interpreted your letters to indicate that there have been no other communications and they have all been turned over. Is that correct?

MS. PARFITT: That's correct, your Honor. I affirmed with Judge Pisano that in fact and indeed everything that we had now had been provided to counsel and he seemed satisfied.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. You have an issue still pending before him with regard to the expert Moore and

additional time? Is that still pending?

2.2

MS. O'DELL: It is, your Honor. There was an order that was issued on Thursday and it was entitled I think an order regarding Nadia Moore, but in fact it related to Dr. Saed and some lab notebook issues.

And so the issue with Dr. Moore and the letter regarding the late produced reliance materials is still before your Honor. And what's happened there is, there were about 85 articles that we weren't aware of as well as mixed analyses, and so we brought that to Judge Pisano's attention and asked for after additional time.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. He's very quick. So the fact that he titled that "Moore" I hope he didn't overlook that that's out there.

MS. O'DELL: It appears he's aware of the issues still before him.

Your Honor, while we are speaking of that particular order in regard to Dr. Saed, there were a number of factual findings in the order that we are really concerned about and we feel the record doesn't support it. So we want to make the Court aware that we plan to file an appeal.

Specifically, Judge Pisano I believe had the impression that there was commingling of data in the

```
11
          lab notebooks. That's not accurate. The particular
       1
       2
          studies at issue --
       3
                  JUDGE WOLFSON: You won't have to argue it
          today. Put it as part of your appeal.
       4
       5
                  MS. O'DELL: We'll do that, your Honor.
       6
                  JUDGE WOLFSON: Since you've already
       7
          highlighted for me that that's coming. So I'll wait
       8
          to see that.
       9
                  MS. O'DELL: Yes, your Honor.
                  JUDGE WOLFSON: I'll go right through this the
      10
          way you have it set forth in your status letter.
      11
      12
                  The issue of funding of articles written by
          plaintiffs' experts, I saw the plaintiffs' position
      13
      14
          which is taking a privilege position that it was work
      15
          product. But, in any event, ending the statement
      16
          with:
      17
                  "Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without
          waiving the right to oppose similar requests in the
      18
          future, the PSC states that it did not provide funding
      19
          for the studies in question."
      20
      21
                  MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, that is the correct
      2.2
          position. We did have a chance to speak with Ms.
      23
```

Sharko a bit this morning about that and affirmed again that the plaintiffs' attorneys had no role in any funding, that we were not aware of any funding,

24

25

```
and perhaps it wasn't as artfully and clearly
1
 2
    articulated in the brief, but that is the correct
    position and we relayed that to Ms. Sharko this
 3
    morning. I think we have an understanding.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Does that satisfy your
 6
    inquiry, Ms. Sharko?
 7
            MS. SHARKO: Yes. Based on the conversation
8
    this morning, I just asked Ms. Parfitt to send me a
9
    letter. But she affirmed that they weren't aware of
    any lawyers funding the three studies.
10
            In fact, they didn't even contact Dr. Eslick
11
12
    until after the paper was published. So that resolves
13
    it, if she can just send me a letter.
14
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. Although, of course, it
15
    is on the record today as well, the representation.
16
            MS. SHARKO: That's true. Thank you.
17
            JUDGE WOLFSON: And I know you all get
    transcripts.
18
            MS. PARFITT: Does that suffice?
19
20
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I think it suffices. I have
    your representation on the record and that's pretty
21
2.2
    clear.
23
            Now, let's turn to Daubert briefing.
24
            Apparently, you both agree that you would like
25
    to have very extensive briefing. Defendants
```

```
suggesting 500 pages and plaintiffs saying, Oh, don't
1
 2
    limit me in that way. Of course, it's giving me great
 3
    pause, but it is what it is.
            And when you say that this is the briefing,
 4
    this is the actual briefing. We're not talking about
 5
    exhibits or anything else. Correct?
 6
 7
            MS. SHARKO: Correct.
8
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I take it, it's all in the
9
    works right now, so you have an idea?
            MS. SHARKO: Yes. We are moving ahead very
10
    quickly to finalizing it. We are a little above 500,
11
12
    but we're trying to get it down to 500. We are also
13
    spending a lot of time organizing the exhibits, so
    there is one master set of exhibits to work from.
14
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: How many experts are there?
16
            MS. SHARKO: The plaintiffs have 22.
17
            JUDGE WOLFSON: And you are bringing a Daubert
    motion as to each of those 22?
18
            MS. SHARKO: Yes. But we are organizing the
19
    motions thematically. One motion will cover all the
20
21
    epidemiology issues; one will cover the biologic
2.2
    plausibility issues, et cetera.
23
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I know when you say "one
24
    motion," you are doing this as one omnibus filing
25
    you've asked me for.
```

MS. SHARKO: Correct. 1 2 JUDGE WOLFSON: With a divided up by each of 3 these experts or these themes, as you call them. really want to have a picture of what this is looking 4 like. Is it one filing? Is that what we're talking 5 about? 6 7 Maybe I read your letter incorrectly. I took 8 it as being one omnibus brief that was divided up into 9 sections as to the various experts, so we don't necessarily have to repeat facts at different times 10 and things like that. 11 12 So you're talking about separate briefing that 13 will total 500 pages? 14 MS. SHARKO: Yes. 15 JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. Separate briefing. MS. SHARKO: Right. Six individual briefs 16 17 under one omnibus motion and the notice of motion provides a short road map through the brief, which 18 issues are where, which experts are where, which 19 pieces of their opinions are where. 20 21 JUDGE WOLFSON: Six motions then. 2.2 MS. SHARKO: Yes. 23 JUDGE WOLFSON: Because you divided them up 24 into subject areas.

MS. SHARKO: Correct. But still 500 pages.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. I got it.

2.2

On your side how many experts are you attacking?

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, we have about 17 at this point in time as well. What we have done, and it's quite similar, instead of thematically we will be producing an omnibus brief as well but the disciplines. We've broken it down into epidemiology, and we'll deal with all of those experts, and then we'll go to toxicology. So, again, it will be a more concise presentation to the Court.

JUDGE WOLFSON: It's interesting you use "concise," when we're talking over 500 pages.

MS. PARFITT: That is true.

And then what we would like to do, your Honor, is with regard to the section on epidemiology, we will have the appendices and any relevant exhibits with the epidemiology group, and then there will be a separate appendices with the toxicology, so the Court has available to her that information right in front of you instead of some large appendices that you have to go searching for.

So we are trying to make it as reader friendly as we possible can and we will obviously try and do our very best to get the page numbers down. We have

2.2

an interest in doing that as well. We believe in brevity and the we'll try and exercise that.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. I hear you and I understand that you are all trying to work without giving me more paper than I require. So I appreciate that we are talking about something very substantial.

At this point, frankly, assuming that everyone is doing what they should be doing to try and be as direct and concise, let me just say 500 pages is arbitrary. If we're dealing with our regular page limits under the rules and somebody says, I need 60, I understand it. At the level of 500, what's the difference between 500 and 550?

So I'm not going to put a page limit on it.

Do what you have to do. But keep in mind you don't want me reading more than I have to. Don't repeat yourselves and don't make yourselves crazy trying to cut it down, as you said, if you are a little over 500. Don't waste your time. Another 20 pages is another 20 pages.

MS. SHARKO: Thank you.

JUDGE WOLFSON: All right. So I won't put a page limit on, but keep that in mind really. That's a tremendous amount of reading and to prepare for. So I really do want you to say what you have to say and not

```
17
1
    more than you have to say.
 2
            Now, let's talk about the real issue that you
 3
    have identified for me.
            MR. LAPINSKI: Your Honor, if I could just ask
 4
 5
    a question in regard to the briefing itself?
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes.
 6
 7
            MR. LAPINSKI: A simple question: How many
8
    hard copies does the Court want?
 9
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Two.
            MR. LAPINSKI: Okay. Thank you.
10
            And are we able to send that the next day as
11
12
    compared to having it filed on Tuesday? Because I
13
    know the electronic filing is going to be hours of
    work that will have to be done.
14
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Right.
16
            MR. LAPINSKI: Okay. Thank you.
17
            JUDGE WOLFSON: You're going to overnight it
    or deliver it to me, hand-deliver it. I don't care
18
    how you do it. Believe me, it will not be the first
19
20
    thing I open that day.
21
            So let's talk about the issue that has come
2.2
         The defendants have suggested that we not deal
23
    with qualifications at this stage, and the plaintiffs
24
    have taken the position that they very much want to
25
    deal with the qualifications issue.
```

We all know qualifications is part of the Daubert analysis. That's not in dispute. Neither side disputes that.

I guess what I want to talk about with you a little bit is, if what we are talking about on qualifications is: Is the individual who is opining, is that specialty the one that all of the opinions are directed to? Does it go beyond that?

As opposed to: Do you really think this is the person that has the right education and experience to opine? I'm not sure which it is that you are going to be talking about.

Excuse me. I'm getting info about your Delaware case.

(Pause.)

2.2

JUDGE WOLFSON: Apparently, the judge just indicated it's not emergent. She will wait for the briefs and she will decide about whether to even have oral argument, and I guess the message is that it could take a little while. That's the update on Delaware.

So I'm trying to get a feel of what it is. I will tell you, in my Daubert hearings in the past, frankly, I have found that the time that's spent on qualifications has been wasteful to me oftentimes.

2.2

Unless I'm having, as I said, a real issue that someone does not have the background, that someone just really shouldn't be an expert, that's really the case.

Usually, it's more than an issue of: What is the breadth of the opinions that the expert is giving and are there certain of the opinions that perhaps should be limited because some of those opinions are going beyond the expertise of that expert? That's usually what I have.

So it's generally not the general qualifications and being qualified to be an expert in the area. I think it's more going to the opinions that they are giving. Right? Is that what we are going to be talking about?

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, if I may be heard?

JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes.

MS. PARFITT: I believe that it may go a little bit further than that. The position the plaintiffs have taken is clearly, as you stated, qualifications is one prong of the Daubert analysis.

In this case plaintiffs have endeavored over the last year to produce not only expert reports but also testimony from their experts whose qualifications allow them to talk about the subject matter that will

assist the trier of fact.

2.2

What we have seen with regard to the defense experts are individuals who may be doctors or Ph.D.s but whose background does not in our mind and to our thinking and our challenge should allow them to actually give expert testimony in certain areas that they are rendering, opinions that are rendering, and even qualifications that might entirely cause this Court to view that brief and that individual as someone who should not be testifying in this case.

So I think what we would like to do is take the opportunity to make the appropriate challenges.

We will not waste the Court's time. Those that it would not be appropriate, we'll make those decisions.

In the course of briefing, we won't waste your time.

But I think to suggest that we don't have an opportunity -- and I'm not saying that you are -- to challenge the qualifications would be obviously inappropriate under the Daubert standard.

So we would ask for the opportunity to do that. If defendants don't want to do that, again, it will take less time to do that, we certainly understand. But I assure the Court that any objections with regard to qualifications or any arguments that we make will be appropriate and we'll

2.2

(Pause.)

```
not waste the Court's time. We have X amount of paper in challenges to make, so we know we need to use our time wisely as well, and we expect to do that and we will do that.
```

MS. SHARKO: So we have a Blue Ribbon Panel of highly qualified experts. I think your Honor will conclude as you read the reports. They are not professional witnesses, but they are true scientists. So I take strong issue with everything Ms. Parfitt just said about the defense experts.

Beyond that, the reason we raised the question is exactly for the reason your Honor articulated.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Just give me one second.

JUSGE WOLFSON: I hear where everyone is now.

I'm hearing that the plaintiffs seem to feel with some experts, assuming you are not meaning all, that with some experts you think that they are not qualified at all to be an expert in the area.

MS. PARFITT: In some cases with the expertise that they attempt to give, that's correct, your Honor.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. My compromise would be as follows: To the extent that the objection is to the qualifications of an expert serving as an expert at all in the area in which that expert is opining, go

```
ahead and brief it and make your objection.
1
 2
            If the objection is not that that person is
 3
    not an expert in the area, but you think that there
    are certain opinions that may be limited, please note
 4
    that you are reserving your right to do so, but we
 5
    won't address that at this time.
 6
 7
            MS. SHARKO: Okay. Thank you.
8
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Ms. Parfitt, you look
    confused.
9
            MS. PARFITT: I am. I think I'm trying to
10
    make sure I get the clarification of the Court.
11
12
    think, your Honor, obviously, it goes to the weight
    then.
1.3
14
            JUDGE WOLFSON: To the weight, exactly right.
15
            MS. PARFITT: So I think what you are
16
    suggesting to us is that if it goes to the weight,
    don't bother.
17
18
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Right.
            MS. PARFITT: If it goes to -- I'm just trying
19
    to process how that is actually written because
20
21
    sometimes they are very intertwined, your Honor, and I
2.2
    think you can appreciate that, that it's fairly
23
    intertwined in certain circumstances. That's why I'm
24
    looking for clarification.
25
            JUDGE WOLFSON: I don't know what your
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

```
objections are going to look like. I guess what I
tried to make clear is, if you have a wholesale
objection to an expert because you say, This is not
someone who can really talk about the toxicology.
Their expertise has been in these areas. And while
they may have some knowledge in that area, we do not
think its sufficient to give expert testimony in that
area.
        So you have a wholesale objection to that
```

expert giving any opinions --

MS. PARFITT: In that area.

JUDGE WOLFSON: In that area.

But, on the other hand, if what you've got is you think that as to one particular opinion that that expert has given, while they are an appropriate toxicologist and they can generally talk about the area, but there may be one thing they are talking about that you don't think they have the expertise on, that I don't want to see right now because ultimately that will go to the weight of their opinion.

> MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, may I raise an issue? JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes.

MS. O'DELL: You've given an example of how there may be some unique circumstances that deal with that very issue, and the one that comes to find is Dr. Ann Wylie. It's one of the defense experts.

2.2

This would be an instance where it would be difficult for us not to put forward our challenge now because many of the defense expert reports are focused on not original opinions themselves, but criticisms of the plaintiffs' experts.

In the case of Dr. Wylie, one of her criticisms relates to Dr. Longo's methodology regarding TEM or transmission electron microscopy testing of the historical samples.

Dr. Wylie has published on polarized light microscopy. She's qualified in that area. But she's never published in the area of TEM. She doesn't do TEM testing and she has not looked at talc itself.

So without bringing the whole argument, I would say this would be on appropriate time to bring the challenge to Dr. Wylie's expertise and qualifications regarding the TEM because it goes to her criticism of Dr. Longo.

And so unlike some of the maybe more normal challenges where it would only goes to weight, we feel that challenge is very important to be brought now.

So we would just urge the Court to give us an opportunity to bring whatever qualifications challenges we feel are appropriate. We will endeavor

2.2

not to bring ones that would waste the Court's time, but that's a very important type of challenge at this juncture.

JUDGE WOLFSON: What are you contemplating by qualifications challenges on the defense side against plaintiffs experts?

MS. SHARKO: So knowing the law in New Jersey, for example, the <u>Magistrini</u> and the <u>Pineda</u> cases, the courts are pretty liberal on qualifications. And so I was looking at it the way your Honor said because in my experience in Daubert motions people spend a huge amount of time on qualification issues that really should be reserved for later on if the case goes to trial.

So that's why we raised it because, yes, we could write briefs about how Dr. Clarke-Pearson is a gynecologist and now he's offering opinions about inhalation of asbestos and epidemiology and these other things. But it seems to me that should wait.

All of these experts on our side are highly qualified. All of the experts on the plaintiffs' side are probably qualified to talk about something. They may not by qualified to talk about everything in their opinions, but I think our time is best focused on the big picture issue.

2.2

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, not to beat the dead horse, but it's interesting that we are not raising the qualification issue. It's the defense that are raising the qualifications asking it be waived.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Not waived.

MS. PARFITT: And I know you're not doing that.

either. I think what their suggestion is, at this juncture it doesn't make sense to spend the time on it, and that's something obviously better done as we approach trial assuming that the experts are qualified otherwise to give the opinions that the opinions satisfy the Daubert standards.

I understand that some of this may be intertwined. I get it. I guess what I really wanted to do is -- go ahead. You wanted to say something else before I make my comments.

MS. PARFITT: I do appreciate that, your

Honor, and I think the Court is hearing what we are

trying to say. This is our opportunity during the

Daubert process to make those kinds of challenges and

I guess I would urge the Court, just as we have done I

think up to this point in time, that we are not here

to waste the Court's time listening to the Court.

2.2

We won't make those kinds of arguments that the Court would come back and say, See, I told you that you are going to waste my time. We're not going to do that. But there are certain circumstances and there will be certain experts where I think it's very relevant.

This is our time. We want to get to a trial.

And like the Court, we recognize the importance of these challenges now on who should be able to stand before the Court and who should not. We need to appropriately give the Court at least the facts and the information and let the Court decide ultimately.

That's all we are endeavoring to do, to afford the opportunity which Daubert permits. Again, we'll use great objectivity and good judgment with regard to the arguments. I don't want to hear from the Court either that I wasted her time.

JUDGE WOLFSON: No, you don't want to do that.

MS. PARFITT: I know. I don't.

JUSGE WOLFSON: I have infinite patience but there is a limit.

MS. PARFITT: I understand. And we do have -I'm not sure that we need it, but we've done a quick
letter brief, your Honor, on it, everything the Court
has said.

2.2

JUDGE WOLFSON: Let me do the following: I really don't want to make this an issue down the line when all we are trying to do is find a way to go about this process which is going to be lengthy and tedious in a most expeditious way.

I'm not going to bar you from making a qualification argument. What I would like you to do, though, is I don't want extensive briefing on it. If what you want to do, so that it's made clear to me, as you said a moment ago, if you want to highlight for me me that on a particular expert you think that they did not have the background and expertise to opine on that particular issue, fine, highlight it for me.

I don't need chapter and verse on it. You preserved your right. That's true on both sides.

Just as you've just done. You said you've got someone that's a gynecologist but now they are talking about other things. Highlight it for me.

I don't want extensive briefing on it. I don't need to know the law on qualifications. I know the law on qualifications. If you want to tell me as to a particular expert that issue, let me know about it. You can put it in your briefing.

MS. PARFITT: Thank you.

MS. SHARKO: Thank you.

2.2

JUDGE WOLFSON: While we are on Daubert, let's look at our schedule again.

Is it the intent to -- all of these challenges, you've got 22, you've got 17. That's 39 experts. Are we talking about bringing them all in to testify or are there only certain ones and you are relying on the papers as to others?

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, I believe a session ago, a status conference ago, the Court indicated that you yourself might have certain individuals that you would wish to hear from. There may be certain individuals that we want the Court to hear from and I think you mentioned the defense as well.

We haven't talked prior to today how you envision this process to be. You are absolutely correct. We've got 39. I assume the Court will be reading the papers and deciding initially who you may feel you may need to hear from, and of course we want to hear that from you.

We need to know from you those individuals where you may have some questions, and there may be some individuals that we would like the Court to hear from as well. We haven't really talked about it.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I would like to talk about it today. We're getting too close to the time and people

```
30
    have to plan schedules for experts and things of that
1
 2
    nature.
 3
            MS. PARFITT: That's right.
            JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes, Mr. Williams.
 4
 5
            MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, all I was going to
    say -- Bart Williams for Johnson and Johnson.
 6
 7
            We actually agree with the point that was just
8
    made by Ms. Parfitt, that after all the briefing is in
    we would welcome the Court focusing us on what the
 9
    Court really wants to hear since this is a lot of
10
11
    witnesses and we would react to that, as long as we
12
    have an opportunity on both sides to make some sort of
    recommendations to the Court for its consideration.
13
14
            JUDGE WOLFSON: This is what I'm going to
15
    suggest having listened to both of you.
16
            First of all, the briefing will be complete on
    what date?
17
            MS. O'DELL: I believe June the 12th.
18
            JUDGE WOLFSON: It's not a lot of time in
19
20
    between then and when we are starting the hearings.
21
    We start on July 22nd. Right?
2.2
            MR. WILLIAMS: Correct.
23
            MS. O'DELL: Correct.
24
            JUDGE WOLFSON: It's not a lot of time.
25
    about a month of time where I've got a number of other
```

things in there as well including a couple of Judicial 1 2 Conferences that I sit on that I have to travel for. 3 So what I think I would like you to do is, when you submit your briefing, for you to very 4 carefully also point out who you think would be 5 critical experts that would be beneficial for me to 6 7 hear, and I would like to have your input as I'm 8 reading, and I'll let you know if I agree or not, but then I'll respond to that. 9 I would rather do it that way because you must 10 have in mind certain people that you would like me to 11 12 hear. 13 MR. WILLIAMS: Very well your Honor. 14 MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, may I just ask a 15 quick question? JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes. 16 17 MS. O'DELL: When you say submit it with briefing, are you meaning with the June 12th briefing 18 19 we would submit the witnesses at that point? 20 JUDGE WOLFSON: Yes, at the end, not at the 21 beginning. 2.2 MS. O'DELL: Thank you. JUDGE WOLFSON: I have you blocked out for the 23 24

whole week of June 22nd. I have you on for the week of the 29th, but I'm not going to see you on Friday,

25

the 2nd. So you have four days that week, and I'm out the following week.

Then I have us picking up again on

August 19th, if necessary, and essentially I have the

last half of August available for you. Hopefully,

we're going nowhere near all that time. But somewhere

in there I may have to fill in a sentencing here or

there as well, but hopefully not too much time.

If you had to -- I know it's pure conjecture at this point -- but if you were thinking in your own mind how many experts you think would be coming in, what would it be on the plaintiffs' side?

MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, we certainly know from our own people, but we haven't seen the challenges. At this moment in time, we are not sure what the challenges are; what the defense is going to argue against our folks, we don't really know.

We may think a particular individual is a stellar person, and we may still feel that after we look at their brief. But it may be a little easier to assess that after we see their briefing, and similarly when they get our challenges to their folks. We'll probably all be a little better positioned to know that.

JUDGE WOLFSON: I would just like to hone in

on the schedule a little bit better.

2.2

MS. PARFITT: I appreciate that, your Honor. I would like to give you a better answer, but I'm not sure that I can.

JUDGE WOLFSON: My concern is for some of that July period, it's really going to require me to not deal with any criminal. August tends to be a slower month for us, as you know, so it's easy for me to know those last two weeks in August. So I'm trying to see if I can work a couple of days in here in July.

So as a result of that, before I skip ahead to the rest of your status, I think I would like to schedule your next status conference after the briefing is done in June, so then we can talk about it on that day. I will not have read all of your briefing by the time you come in in June, but we can at least talk.

We have you on June 27th. That works. That works for us to plan ahead. We have you on for June 27th at 10:30.

MS. SHARKO: Do you want us to have a call in May after the first round of briefing to discuss this?

JUDGE WOLFSON: I don't think so. I think
I'll let you go through the briefing process and
discuss it in June. I'll have your list on June 12th

when you submit your last briefing. Each one of you 1 2 will give me whatever recommendations you have. 3 I'm not setting any other statuses at this point because I'm going to see you in July. So we're 4 all set. 5 6 Now, with regard to every status conference we 7 had, we still have the status of cases that were 8 re-filed per the Case Management Order No. 8, and we still have a number of cases that involve a 9 substantial number of plaintiffs that have motions for 10 remand pending and therefore there has been no filing 11 12 of the short form complaint. Right? 13 MS. O'DELL: That's right your Honor. JUDGE WOLFSON: Some plaintiffs have re-filed 14 15 in California and New Jersey based on agreements 16 between the parties, and there are some duplicate 17 filed MDL cases that you are still working on submitting an order to me to have them dismissed here. 18 Correct? 19 20 MS. PARFITT: That's right, your Honor. 21 JUDGE WOLFSON: Now, we've got apparently --2.2 I'm looking at page 4 of your status letter. It says: 23 "There are approximately 261 plaintiffs who

have not filed short form complaints pursuant to CMO 8. Defendants request that the Court order these

24

25

plaintiffs to file short form complaints by May 31, 2019."

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, our position on that is that we just got the list and we need time to reach out to individual counsel to reconcile it and really know what universe of cases we are dealing with and can address it from there. But we are already actively doing that.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Are you telling me, therefore, you can't live with the May 31st date?

MS. O'DELL: That's right, your Honor.

We just need time to know if that's the correct list. Undoubtedly, there will be some cases that there is a short form complaint filed. That has been our experience in the past and we need to communicate that and make sure that it is a correct list, and then I think it would be very reasonable to think that we could set a date in June to have short form complaints filed, but May 31st would probably not give us sufficient time.

It's better if it's June 30. I don't know what day that is. But that is just pushing it 30 days, or maybe July 1st, which is a Monday would give us sufficient time to alert counsel and make sure they are aware of the situation.

```
JUDGE WOLFSON: Ms. Sharko, I don't think you
1
 2
    have a major objection to it.
 3
            MS. SHARKO: No. We keep sending out the
    list, but July 1st is fine. Thank you.
 4
 5
            JUDGE WOLFSON: All right. July 1.
            The next one talks about 55 plaintiffs with
 6
7
    multiple cases pending, and this is another one where
8
    the plaintiffs indicate that they are still reviewing.
 9
            MS. PARFITT: Your Honor, that's correct.
            I'm looking at a list that my office printed
10
    out and it's more than 55. That makes me a bit
11
12
    concerned that we need to get our arms around it.
13
    I've talked to counsel as well. We're going to talk
14
    about it and we'll go through the list.
15
            JUDGE WOLFSON: That you could do by May 31.
            MS. PARFITT: May 31. All right. We will
16
17
    talk soon.
            Your Honor, I have every reason and hope that
18
    I can because I have many other things to do and I
19
    want to get past this one as well. But in the event
20
21
    we are having difficulty locating a counsel -- again,
2.2
    these are not us.
23
            These are people outside of the world of
24
    people sitting here today. If I should have a
25
    problem, I would just ask the Court's indulgence on
```

those that we may not be able to track down.

2.2

removals and remands.

JUDGE WOLFSON: If you have particular ones, if we have a date that's a cutoff date, we will make sure that we're working towards that. I understand. If there is a particular one, you can inform defense counsel about that.

We already talked about the removal and the remands.

Anything else you want to tell me in particular about cases pending in other jurisdictions?

MS. O'DELL: Nothing further than what we have already said, your Honor. I believe it's all about

JUDGE WOLFSON: I know. And we have many remands. I'll admit I have many. It's the next thing that I'm turning to, among other things that I know, and I'm going to try to do them in batches and issues that are similar and try and get these out for you. They will be worked on. It's becoming a late spring early summer project.

Anything else you want to address while we are here today?

MS. O'DELL: Your Honor, one brief item.

It's been some months ago now that I raised with the Court the fact that Mark Whitehead, a member

2.2

```
of the Plaintiffs Steering Committee, had been in a place where he had health issues. He wasn't able to participate in activities with the Plaintiffs Steering Committee. Thankfully, he is improving but still is in that posture.
```

So I wanted to alert the Court we will be submitting a letter with a proposed order to the Court accepting Mr. Whiteheads's resignation and moving to have Mr. Tisi appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee. He certainly has been doing yeoman's work for many months and we just had him added to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Defense is taking no position on that, I'm assuming.

MS. SHARKO: Correct.

JUDGE WOLFSON: Okay. Send that in.

Anything else that's going to come my way before I see you in June and you submit your master filings?

Remember also as you go along I want to remind you -- I don't know what else might be coming -- that Dropbox system doesn't work for us. So we need the hard copies on these big filings, and sadly for you on one of those to still highlight the hard copy briefs and tabs on it. That's the way I do it. Maybe some

```
39
    day I'll get better.
1
2
            MS. PARFITT: I join you on that, your Honor.
             JUDGE WOLFSON: Still that yellow highlighter
3
    is the way I like to go.
4
             If there is nothing else, I'll let you all go
5
6
    on and do what else you have to do today.
             THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
7
            (Proceedings concluded.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	\cap

			4 (
0	6	analyses [1] - 10:10	33:7, 33:9
	-	analysis [2] - 18:2, 19:21	automatically [2] - 6:16,
08608 [1] - 1:9	60 [1] - 16:11	ann [1] - 24:1	9:4
	609 [1] - 1:25	answer [1] - 33:3	available [2] - 15:20,
1		appeal [2] - 10:23, 11:4	32:5
1 [1] - 36:5	7		aware [7] - 7:17, 10:9,
10:30 [1] - 33:20	753 [1] - 3:9	appearances [1] - 4:5	
12th [3] - 30:18, 31:18,	733 [1] - 3.9	appendices [3] - 15:17,	10:16, 10:22, 11:25,
33:25	8	15:19, 15:21	12:9, 35:25
		appointed [1] - 38:9	В
16-MD-2738(FLW)(LHG	8 [2] - 34:8, 34:25	appreciate [4] - 16:5,	В
[1] - 1:2	85 [1] - 10:9	22:22, 26:19, 33:2	background [3] - 19:2,
17 [2] - 15:4, 29:4		approach [1] - 26:12	20:4, 28:12
19th [2] - 9:15, 32:4	9	appropriate [7] - 6:5,	Bankruptcy [1] - 6:13
1st [2] - 35:23, 36:4	9th [1] - 5:20	20:12, 20:14, 20:25,	bankruptcy [8] - 6:16,
	341[1] - 3.20	23:15, 24:16, 24:25	6:18, 6:22, 7:1, 7:11,
2	Α	appropriately [1] - 27:11	7:23, 8:21, 9:5
20 [2] - 16:19, 16:20		April [1] - 9:15	bar [1] - 28:6
2019 [2] - 1:5, 35:2	able [4] - 17:11, 27:9,	APRIL [1] - 1:5	BARRY [1] - 2:16
22 [3] - 13:16, 13:18,	37:1, 38:2	arbitrary [1] - 16:10	Bart [2] - 4:25, 30:6
29:4	ABOVE [1] - 3:12	area [12] - 8:23, 19:13,	BART [1] - 2:12
22nd [2] - 30:21, 31:24	ABOVE-ENTITLED [1] -	21:19, 21:25, 22:3, 23:6,	based [2] - 12:7, 34:15
261 [1] - 34:23	3:12	23:8, 23:11, 23:12,	basing [1] - 8:19
27th [2] - 33:18, 33:20	absolutely [1] - 29:15	23:17, 24:12, 24:13	batches [1] - 37:17
28 [1] - 3:9	accepting [1] - 38:8	areas [3] - 14:24, 20:6,	BE [1] - 3:10
29 [1] - 1:5	accurate [2] - 5:25, 11:1	23:5	BEASLEY [1] - 1:14
29 [1] - 1.3 29th [1] - 31:25	ACCURATE [1] - 3:10	argue [2] - 11:3, 32:17	beat [1] - 26:1
	ACTION [1] - 1:2	argument [3] - 18:19,	
2nd [1] - 32:1	actively [1] - 35:8	24:15, 28:7	becoming [1] - 37:19
3	activities [1] - 38:3	arguments [3] - 20:25,	begin [1] - 5:16
3	actual [2] - 8:17, 13:5	27:1, 27:16	beginning [1] - 31:21
3 [2] - 8:8, 8:20	added [1] - 38:11	arms [1] - 36:12	behalf [4] - 2:7, 2:13,
30 [2] - 35:21, 35:22	additional [2] - 10:1,	ARPS [1] - 2:10	2:20, 5:7
31 [3] - 35:1, 36:15,	10:12	artfully [1] - 12:1	Behalf [1] - 2:17
36:16	address [3] - 22:6, 35:7,	Article [2] - 8:8, 8:20	Beisner [1] - 5:7
31st [2] - 35:10, 35:19	37:21	articles [2] - 10:9, 11:12	BEISNER [2] - 2:11, 5:6
39 [2] - 29:4, 29:16	admit [1] - 37:15	= =	beneficial [1] - 31:6
	affirmed [3] - 9:21,	articulated [2] - 12:2, 21:12	BERMAN [3] - 1:20, 1:20,
4	11:23, 12:9	asbestos [1] - 25:18	4:18
4 [1] - 34:22	afford [1] - 27:13	ASHCRAFT [1] - 1:15	Berman [1] - 4:18
4 [1] - 34.22 402 [1] - 1:9	anord [1] - 27.13 ago [4] - 28:10, 29:9,		best [2] - 15:25, 25:24
402 [1] - 1.8	ago [4] - 26.10, 29.9, 37:24	assess [1] - 32:21	better [6] - 26:11, 32:23,
F		assigned [5] - 6:25, 7:7,	33:1, 33:3, 35:21, 39:1
5	agree [3] - 12:24, 30:7, 31:8	7:8, 7:17, 8:3	between [3] - 16:13,
500 [10] - 13:1, 13:11,		assist [1] - 20:1	30:20, 34:16
13:12, 14:13, 14:25,	agreements [1] - 34:15	assume [1] - 29:16	beyond [3] - 18:8, 19:9,
15:13, 16:9, 16:12,	ahead [5] - 13:10, 22:1,	assuming [4] - 16:7,	21:11
16:13, 16:19	26:17, 33:11, 33:19	21:17, 26:12, 38:14	BIDDLE [1] - 2:8
524 [1] - 7:18	ALABAMA [1] - 1:14	assure [1] - 20:23	big [2] - 25:25, 38:23
55 [2] - 36:6, 36:11	alert [2] - 35:24, 38:6	Atlantic [1] - 6:7	biologic [1] - 13:21
550 [1] - 16:13	ALLEN [1] - 1:14	attacking [1] - 15:3	bit [6] - 7:10, 11:23, 18:5,
588-9516 [1] - 1:25	allow [2] - 19:25, 20:5	attempt [1] - 21:21	19:19, 33:1, 36:11
l ' <i>'</i>	amount [3] - 16:24, 21:1,	attention [1] - 10:11	blocked [1] - 31:23
	25:12	attorneys [1] - 11:24	Blue [1] - 21:5
	AN [1] - 3:10	August [4] - 32:4, 32:5,	[.]

bother [1] - 22:17 breadth [1] - 19:6 brevity [1] - 16:2 brief [9] - 12:2, 14:8, 14:18, 15:7, 20:9, 22:1, 27:24, 32:20, 37:23 briefing [23] - 5:24, 12:23, 12:25, 13:4, 13:5, 14:12, 14:15, 17:5, 20:15, 28:8, 28:19, 28:23, 30:8, 30:16, 31:4, 31:18, 32:21, 33:14, 33:16, 33:22, 33:24, 34:1 briefs [4] - 14:16, 18:18, 25:16, 38:24 bring [3] - 24:16, 24:24, bringing [3] - 13:17, 24:15, 29:5 broken [1] - 15:8 brought [3] - 6:1, 10:10, 24:22 **BY** [12] - 1:14, 1:16, 1:17, 1:19, 1:20, 2:6, 2:9, 2:11, 2:12, 2:15, 2:17, 2:20

С

CALIFORNIA [1] - 2:12 California [1] - 34:15 Camden [1] - 6:7 **Canada** [1] - 9:15 Care [2] - 2:17, 5:10 care [1] - 17:18 carefully [1] - 31:5 Caroline [1] - 5:13 **CAROLINE** [1] - 2:20 case [6] - 18:14, 19:4, 19:22, 20:10, 24:7, 25:13 Case [1] - 34:8 cases [14] - 6:6, 7:16, 7:18, 7:24, 9:10, 21:20, 25:8, 34:7, 34:9, 34:17, 35:6, 35:13, 36:7, 37:10 CCR [2] - 1:24, 3:17 certain [10] - 19:7, 20:6, 22:4, 22:23, 27:4, 27:5, 29:6, 29:10, 29:11, 31:11 certainly [4] - 8:15, 20:22, 32:13, 38:10

cetera [1] - 13:22 **challenge** [6] - 20:5, 20:18, 24:3, 24:17, 24:22, 25:2 challenges [11] - 20:12, 21:2, 24:21, 24:25, 25:5, 26:22, 27:9, 29:4, 32:15, 32:16, 32:22 **chambers** [2] - 6:4, 8:3 chance [1] - 11:22 **chapter** [1] - 28:14 **CHEONG** [1] - 2:17 Chief [1] - 6:13 Chris [1] - 4:11 CHRISTOPHER [1] -1:17 circumstances [3] -22:23, 23:24, 27:4 **CIVIL** [1] - 1:2 clarification [2] - 22:11, 22:24 **Clarke** [1] - 25:16 Clarke-Pearson [1] -25:16 **CLARKSON** [1] - 1:8 clear [3] - 12:22, 23:2, 28:9 clearly [2] - 12:1, 19:20 **CLERK** [2] - 4:3, 39:7 close [1] - 29:25 **CMO** [1] - 34:24 coming [4] - 5:23, 11:7, 32:11, 38:21 **comments** [1] - 26:18 **commingling** [1] - 10:25 **Committee** [5] - 2:7, 38:1, 38:4, 38:10, 38:12 **communicate** [1] - 35:16 communications [2] -9:14, 9:18 compared [1] - 17:12 complaint [2] - 34:12, 35:14 complaints [3] - 34:24, 35:1, 35:19 **complete** [1] - 30:16 completed [1] - 5:24 **compromise** [1] - 21:22 concern [1] - 33:5 concerned [2] - 10:21, 36:12 concise [3] - 15:11,

CERTIFIED [1] - 3:10

15:13, 16:9 conclude [1] - 21:7 **concluded** [1] - 39:8 confer [1] - 6:12 conference [3] - 29:9, 33:13, 34:6 **CONFERENCE** [1] - 1:5 **Conferences** [1] - 31:2 confess [1] - 8:21 confirmation [1] - 9:16 confused [1] - 22:9 conjecture [1] - 32:9 connection [1] - 6:3 consider [1] - 8:11 consideration [2] - 5:20, 30:13 consistent [1] - 6:14 consult [1] - 9:9 contact [2] - 8:2, 12:11 contacted [1] - 6:4 contemplating [1] - 25:4 continued [1] - 1:23 conversation [1] - 12:7 copies [2] - 17:8, 38:23 copy [1] - 38:24 **correct** [18] - 6:23, 9:19, 9:20, 11:21, 12:2, 13:6, 13:7, 14:1, 14:25, 21:21, 29:16, 30:22, 30:23, 34:19, 35:13, 35:16, 36:9, 38:15 Council [2] - 2:17, 5:11 counsel [7] - 9:17, 9:23, 35:5, 35:24, 36:13, 36:21, 37:6 **County** [1] - 6:7 couple [2] - 31:1, 33:10 course [4] - 12:14, 13:2, 20:15, 29:18 **COURT** [3] - 1:1, 1:25, court [9] - 4:1, 5:17, 6:5, 6:16, 6:18, 6:22, 7:18, 7:23, 9:5 Court [31] - 6:14, 7:23, 10:22, 15:11, 15:19, 17:8, 20:9, 20:23, 22:11, 24:23, 26:20, 26:23, 26:25, 27:2, 27:8, 27:10, 27:11, 27:12, 27:16, 27:24, 29:9, 29:12, 29:16, 29:22, 30:9, 30:10, 30:13, 34:25,

37:25, 38:6, 38:7

Court's [5] - 20:13, 21:1, 25:1, 26:25, 36:25

COURTHOUSE [1] - 1:8

courts [1] - 25:9

cover [2] - 13:20, 13:21

crazy [1] - 16:17

criminal [1] - 33:7

critical [1] - 31:6

criticism [1] - 24:19

criticisms [2] - 24:5, 24:8

CRR [1] - 1:24

cut [1] - 16:18

cutoff [1] - 37:3

D

D.C [2] - 2:11, 2:15 dan [1] - 4:13 **DANIEL** [1] - 1:19 data [1] - 10:25 date [5] - 30:17, 35:10, 35:18, 37:3 Daubert [12] - 5:3, 12:23, 13:17, 18:2, 18:23, 19:21, 20:19, 25:11, 26:14, 26:22, 27:14, 29:1 days [3] - 32:1, 33:10, 35:23 dead [1] - 26:1 deal [5] - 15:9, 17:22, 17:25, 23:24, 33:7 dealing [2] - 16:10, 35:6 decide [2] - 18:18, 27:12 deciding [1] - 29:17 decision [4] - 5:17, 7:13, 8:17, 9:13 decisions [1] - 20:14 **Defendant** [2] - 2:13, 2:17 **Defendants** [1] - 2:20 defendants [6] - 4:22, 5:7, 12:25, 17:22, 20:21, 34:25 defense [10] - 20:2, 21:10, 24:1, 24:4, 25:5, 26:3, 29:13, 32:16, 37:5, 38:13 **Delaware** [3] - 5:17, 18:14, 18:21 deliver [2] - 17:18 **DEPUTY** [2] - 4:3, 39:7

difference [1] - 16:13 different [1] - 14:10 difficult [1] - 24:3 difficulty [1] - 36:21 direct [2] - 7:22, 16:9 directed [3] - 6:9, 7:6, 18:8 direction [1] - 8:4 directly [1] - 6:17 disciplines [1] - 15:8 discuss [2] - 33:22, 33:25 dismissed [1] - 34:18 dispute [1] - 18:2 disputes [1] - 18:3 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:1 district [1] - 8:24 **District** [1] - 9:4 divided [3] - 14:2, 14:8, 14:23 doctors [1] - 20:3 done [10] - 6:22, 8:17, 8:23, 15:5, 17:14, 26:11, 26:23, 27:23, 28:16, 33:14 down [6] - 13:12, 15:8, 15:25, 16:18, 28:2, 37:1 Dr [11] - 10:5, 10:6, 10:19, 12:11, 23:25, 24:7, 24:8, 24:11, 24:17, 24:19, 25:16 **DRINKER** [1] - 2:8 **Dropbox** [1] - 38:22 due [1] - 5:20 duplicate [1] - 34:16 during [1] - 26:21

Ε

early [1] - 37:20
easier [1] - 32:20
EAST [1] - 1:9
easy [1] - 33:8
education [1] - 18:10
either [2] - 26:9, 27:17
electron [1] - 24:9
electronic [1] - 17:13
ELLIS [1] - 2:19
emergent [1] - 18:17
end [1] - 31:20
endeavor [1] - 24:25
endeavored [1] - 19:22
endeavoring [1] - 27:13

ended [1] - 6:6 ending [1] - 11:15 entirely [1] - 20:8 entitled [1] - 10:3 **ENTITLED** [1] - 3:12 **envision** [1] - 29:15 epidemiology [5] -13:21, 15:8, 15:16, 15:18, 25:18 Eslick [1] - 12:11 **ESQUIRE** [15] - 1:14, 1:16, 1:17, 1:19, 1:20, 1:21, 2:6, 2:9, 2:9, 2:11, 2:12, 2:13, 2:15, 2:17, 2:20 **ESQUIRES** [12] - 1:14, 1:15, 1:17, 1:18, 1:20, 2:6, 2:8, 2:10, 2:12, 2:15, 2:16, 2:19 **essentially** [1] - 32:4 et [1] - 13:22 event [3] - 6:1, 11:15, 36:20 exactly [2] - 21:12, 22:14 example [2] - 23:23, 25:8 excuse [1] - 18:13 **exercise** [1] - 16:2 exhibits [4] - 13:6, 13:13, 13:14, 15:17 expect [2] - 5:20, 21:3 **expeditious** [1] - 28:5 **experience** [3] - 18:10, 25:11, 35:15 expert [19] - 9:25, 19:3, 19:6, 19:9, 19:12, 19:23, 20:6, 21:19, 21:24, 21:25, 22:3, 23:3, 23:7, 23:10, 23:15, 24:4, 28:11, 28:22 **expertise** [6] - 19:9, 21:20, 23:5, 23:18, 24:17, 28:12 experts [25] - 9:14, 11:13, 13:15, 14:3, 14:9, 14:19, 15:2, 15:9, 19:24, 20:3, 21:6, 21:10, 21:17, 21:18, 24:1, 24:6, 25:6, 25:20, 25:21, 26:12, 27:5, 29:5, 30:1, 31:6, 32:11 **extensive** [3] - 12:25,

28:8, 28:19

extent [1] - 21:23

37:25 facts [2] - 14:10, 27:11 factual [1] - 10:20 fairly [1] - 22:22 far [2] - 7:4, 7:16 Ferguson [6] - 5:23, 6:13, 7:5, 8:10, 9:7, 9:9 Ferguson's [1] - 8:2 file [2] - 10:23, 35:1 filed [11] - 5:19, 6:17, 7:20, 17:12, 34:8, 34:14, 34:17, 34:24, 35:14, 35:19 filing [4] - 13:24, 14:5, 17:13, 34:11 filings [2] - 38:19, 38:23 fill [1] - 32:7 finalizing [1] - 13:11 **findings** [1] - 10:20 fine [2] - 28:13, 36:4 firm [1] - 5:1 first [4] - 6:17, 17:19, 30:16, 33:22 **FISHER** [1] - 1:8 **FLOM** [1] - 2:10 **FLORIDA** [1] - 1:17 focused [2] - 24:4, 25:24 **focusing** [1] - 30:9 folks [2] - 32:17, 32:22 **FOLLOWING** [1] - 3:10 following [2] - 28:1, 32:2 follows [1] - 21:23 **FOR** [1] - 1:1 foregoing [1] - 11:17 form [5] - 34:12, 34:24, 35:1, 35:14, 35:19 forth [1] - 11:11 forum [1] - 7:12 forward [1] - 24:3 four [1] - 32:1 frankly [2] - 16:7, 18:24 FREDA [1] - 1:11 Friday [1] - 31:25 friendly [1] - 15:23 front [1] - 15:20 funding [5] - 11:12, 11:19, 11:25, 12:10

future [1] - 11:19

F

fact [6] - 9:21, 10:4,

10:14, 12:11, 20:1,

general [1] - 19:11 generally [2] - 19:11, 23:16 **GEREL** [1] - 1:15 given [3] - 8:12, 23:15, 23:23 **GOLOMB** [3] - 2:6, 2:6, 4:16 Golomb [1] - 4:16 great [2] - 13:2, 27:15 group [1] - 15:18 guess [7] - 6:6, 9:16, 18:4, 18:19, 23:1, 26:16, 26:23 gynecologist [2] - 25:17, 28:17

G

Н

half [1] - 32:5 hand [2] - 17:18, 23:13 hand-deliver [1] - 17:18 handled [1] - 6:20 happy [2] - 4:22, 4:24 hard [3] - 17:8, 38:23, 38:24 health [1] - 38:2 Health [1] - 9:15 hear [11] - 16:3, 21:15, 27:16, 29:11, 29:12, 29:18, 29:19, 29:22, 30:10, 31:7, 31:12 heard [1] - 19:16 hearing [2] - 21:16, 26:20 hearings [2] - 18:23, 30:20 highlight [4] - 28:10, 28:13, 28:18, 38:24 highlighted [1] - 11:7 highlighter [1] - 39:3 highly [2] - 21:6, 25:20 historical [1] - 24:10 hone [1] - 32:25 HONIK [1] - 2:6 Honor [47] - 4:8, 4:10, 4:12, 4:14, 5:6, 5:9, 5:12, 5:18, 7:15, 8:7, 8:11, 9:20, 10:2, 10:8, 10:18, 11:5, 11:9, 11:21, 15:4, 15:15, 17:4, 19:16, 21:6, 21:12, 21:21,

22:12, 22:21, 23:21, 25:10, 26:1, 26:20, 27:24, 29:8, 30:5, 31:13, 31:14, 32:13, 33:2, 34:13, 34:20, 35:3, 35:11, 36:9, 36:18, 37:12, 37:23, 39:2

HONORABLE [1] - 1:11
hope [2] - 10:14, 36:18
hopefully [2] - 32:5, 32:8
horse [1] - 26:2
hours [1] - 17:13
huge [1] - 25:11

ı

idea [1] - 13:9 identified [1] - 17:3 importance [1] - 27:8 important [2] - 24:22, **impression** [1] - 10:25 improving [1] - 38:4 **IN** [2] - 1:4, 3:11 inappropriate [1] - 20:19 including [1] - 31:1 incorrectly [1] - 14:7 indeed [1] - 9:21 indicate [3] - 8:16, 9:18, indicated [2] - 18:17, 29:9 indication [2] - 7:2, 8:15 individual [5] - 14:16, 18:6, 20:9, 32:18, 35:5 individuals [5] - 20:3, 29:10, 29:12, 29:20, 29:22 indulgence [1] - 36:25 infinite [1] - 27:20 **info** [1] - 18:13 **inform** [1] - 37:5 information [2] - 15:20, 27:12 inhalation [1] - 25:18 **input** [1] - 31:7 inquiry [1] - 12:6 instance [1] - 24:2 **instances** [1] - 8:9 instead [2] - 15:6, 15:21 intent [1] - 29:3 interest [1] - 16:1 interesting [2] - 15:12,

26:2 interim [1] - 7:9 **interpreted** [1] - 9:17 intertwined [3] - 22:21, 22:23, 26:16 involve [1] - 34:9 involved [1] - 8:2 **IS** [1] - 3:10 issue [19] - 8:2, 9:13, 9:24, 10:6, 11:2, 11:12, 17:2, 17:21, 17:25, 19:1, 19:5, 21:9, 23:21, 23:25, 25:25, 26:3, 28:2, 28:13, 28:22 **issued** [1] - 10:3 issues [10] - 5:3, 8:25,

J

10:5, 10:17, 13:21,

13:22, 14:19, 25:12,

itself [2] - 17:5, 24:14

37:17, 38:2

issuing [1] - 8:10

item [1] - 37:23

J&J [2] - 4:21, 5:7 **JENNIFER** [1] - 2:17 **Jersey** [5] - 6:15, 7:19, 9:4, 25:7, 34:15 **JERSEY** [5] - 1:1, 1:19, 2:9, 2:9, 2:17 **John** [1] - 5:7 **JOHN** [1] - 2:11 **JOHNSON** [2] - 1:4 **Johnson** [4] - 2:13, 30:6 join [1] - 39:2 Judge [11] - 5:22, 6:13, 7:5, 8:2, 8:10, 9:6, 9:8, 9:13, 9:21, 10:11, 10:24 **JUDGE** [75] - 4:4, 4:20, 4:24, 5:5, 5:15, 5:22, 6:25, 7:6, 8:1, 8:14, 9:1, 9:8, 9:24, 10:13, 11:3, 11:6, 11:10, 12:5, 12:14, 12:17, 12:20, 13:8, 13:15, 13:17, 13:23, 14:2, 14:15, 14:21, 14:23, 15:1, 15:12, 16:3, 16:22, 17:6, 17:9, 17:15, 17:17, 18:16, 19:17, 21:13, 21:22, 22:8, 22:14, 22:18, 22:25, 23:12, 23:22, 25:4, 26:5, 26:8, 27:18, 28:1, 29:1,

29:24, 30:4, 30:14, 30:19, 30:24, 31:16, 31:20, 31:23, 32:25, 33:5, 33:23, 34:14, 34:21, 35:9, 36:1, 36:5, 36:15, 37:2, 37:14, 38:13, 38:16, 39:3 judge [3] - 7:1, 8:20, 18:16 judges [2] - 8:8, 8:24 judgment [1] - 27:15 Judicial [1] - 31:1 JULIE [1] - 2:9 Julie [1] - 4:22 July [7] - 30:21, 33:6, 33:10, 34:4, 35:23, 36:4, 36:5 juncture [2] - 25:3, 26:10 June [12] - 30:18, 31:18, 31:24, 33:14, 33:16, 33:18, 33:20, 33:25, 35:18, 35:21, 38:18 jurisdictional [1] - 8:24 jurisdictions [2] - 9:3, 37:10 JUSGE [2] - 21:15, 27:20

Κ

keep [3] - 16:15, 16:23, 36:3 kinds [2] - 26:22, 27:1 knowing [1] - 25:7 knowledge [1] - 23:6

L

lab [2] - 10:5, 11:1

LAPINSKI [6] - 1:19, 4:12, 17:4, 17:7, 17:10, 17:16 Lapinski [1] - 4:13 large [1] - 15:21 last [7] - 5:23, 6:22, 7:10, 19:23, 32:5, 33:9, 34:1 late [2] - 10:7, 37:19 **LAURENCE** [1] - 1:20 **Laurence** [1] - 4:18 law [4] - 8:22, 25:7, 28:20, 28:21 lawyers [2] - 5:2, 12:10 learn [1] - 7:10 least [4] - 7:12, 7:17, 27:11, 33:17

LEE [1] - 2:13 **LEIGH** [1] - 1:14 **Leigh** [1] - 4:9 lengthy [1] - 28:4 less [1] - 20:22 letter [10] - 9:12, 9:15, 10:6, 11:11, 12:9, 12:13, 14:7, 27:24, 34:22, 38:7 letters [1] - 9:17 level [1] - 16:12 **LEVIN** [2] - 1:17, 1:20 liberal [1] - 25:9 light [2] - 7:9, 24:11 limit [4] - 13:2, 16:14, 16:23, 27:21 limited [2] - 19:8, 22:4 limits [1] - 16:11 line [1] - 28:2 list [7] - 33:25, 35:4, 35:13, 35:17, 36:4, 36:10, 36:14 listened [1] - 30:15 listening [1] - 26:25 live [1] - 35:10 **LLC** [2] - 2:20, 2:21 locating [1] - 36:21 location [1] - 6:11 **LOCKE** [2] - 2:15, 5:9 Locke [1] - 5:10 **Longo** [1] - 24:19 Longo's [1] - 24:8 look [4] - 22:8, 23:1, 29:2, 32:20 looked [1] - 24:14 **looking** [5] - 14:4, 22:24, 25:10, 34:22, 36:10

M

Magistrini [1] - 25:8
major [1] - 36:2
Management [1] - 34:8
map [1] - 14:18
Mark [1] - 37:25
MARKETING [1] - 1:5
master [2] - 13:14, 38:18
materials [1] - 10:7
matter [1] - 19:25
MATTER [1] - 3:12
matters [1] - 6:15
McTIERNAN [1] - 2:16
MDL [1] - 34:17
MEAGHER [1] - 2:10

meaning [2] - 21:17, 31:18 member [1] - 37:25 mentioned [2] - 5:1, 29:13 message [1] - 18:19 methodology [1] - 24:8 MICHAEL [1] - 1:21 Michelle [1] - 4:6 **MICHELLE** [1] - 1:16 microscopy [2] - 24:9, 24:12 might [3] - 20:8, 29:10, 38:21 Mike [1] - 4:15 mind [5] - 16:15, 16:23, 20:4, 31:11, 32:11 **MISSOURI** [1] - 2:20 mixed [1] - 10:10 moment [3] - 6:2, 28:10, 32:15 Monday [1] - 35:23 month [2] - 30:25, 33:8 months [2] - 37:24, 38:11 Moore [4] - 9:25, 10:4, 10:6, 10:14 morning [12] - 4:8, 4:10, 4:12, 4:14, 5:4, 5:5, 5:6, 5:9, 5:12, 11:23, 12:4, 12:8 most [1] - 28:5 motion [9] - 5:17, 5:21, 7:24, 8:8, 13:18, 13:20, 13:24, 14:17 motions [6] - 7:20, 9:4, 13:20, 14:21, 25:11, 34:10 **MOTLEY** [1] - 1:18 moving [2] - 13:10, 38:8 **MR** [15] - 4:10, 4:12, 4:14, 4:16, 4:18, 5:4, 5:6, 5:9, 17:4, 17:7, 17:10, 17:16, 30:5, 30:22, 31:13 **MS** [73] - 4:6, 4:8, 4:21, 4:25, 5:12, 5:18, 6:24, 7:4, 7:15, 8:7, 8:21, 9:2, 9:20, 10:2, 10:16, 11:5, 11:9, 11:21, 12:7, 12:16, 12:19, 13:7, 13:10, 13:16, 13:19, 14:1,

14:14, 14:16, 14:22,

14:25, 15:4, 15:14, 16:21, 19:16, 19:18, 21:5, 21:20, 22:7, 22:10, 22:15, 22:19, 23:11, 23:21, 23:23, 25:7, 26:1, 26:6, 26:19, 27:19, 27:22, 28:24, 28:25, 29:8, 30:3, 30:18, 30:23, 31:14, 31:17, 31:22, 32:13, 33:2, 33:21, 34:13, 34:20, 35:3, 35:11, 36:3, 36:9, 36:16, 37:11, 37:23, 38:15, 39:2 multiple [1] - 36:7 must [1] - 31:10

Ν

MY [1] - 3:11

Nadia [1] - 10:4 **nature** [1] - 30:2 near [1] - 32:6 **necessarily** [1] - 14:10 necessary [1] - 32:4 **need** [13] - 16:11, 21:2, 27:10, 27:23, 28:14, 28:20, 29:18, 29:20, 35:4, 35:12, 35:15, 36:12, 38:22 never [1] - 24:13 new [1] - 8:21 **New** [5] - 6:15, 7:19, 9:4, 25:7, 34:15 **NEW** [6] - 1:1, 1:19, 2:9, 2:9, 2:13, 2:17 next [4] - 17:11, 33:13, 36:6, 37:15 **nine** [1] - 6:6 **NJ** [1] - 1:9 **NO** [1] - 1:2 normal [1] - 24:20 note [1] - 22:4 **notebook** [1] - 10:5 notebooks [1] - 11:1 **NOTES** [1] - 3:11 nothing [2] - 37:11, 39:5 notice [1] - 14:17 notwithstanding [1] -11:17 nowhere [1] - 32:6 number [6] - 6:21, 9:3, 10:20, 30:25, 34:9,

34:10

numbers [1] - 15:25

O'DELL [23] - 1:14, 4:8,

5:18, 7:15, 8:7, 8:21,

9:2, 10:2, 10:16, 11:5, 11:9, 23:21, 23:23, 30:18, 30:23, 31:14, 31:17, 31:22, 34:13, 35:3, 35:11, 37:11, 37:23 O'Dell [1] - 4:9 objection [6] - 21:23, 22:1, 22:2, 23:3, 23:9, objections [2] - 20:24, 23:1 **objectivity** [1] - 27:15 **obviously** [5] - 5:24, 15:24, 20:18, 22:12, 26:11 **odd** [1] - 7:18 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:4, 3:11 offer [1] - 9:2 offering [1] - 25:17 office [1] - 36:10 **OFFICIAL** [2] - 1:25, 3:17 oftentimes [1] - 18:25 omnibus [5] - 7:24, 13:24, 14:8, 14:17, 15:7 once [1] - 9:9 one [27] - 5:2, 6:11, 7:21, 8:6, 13:14, 13:20, 13:21, 13:23, 13:24, 14:5, 14:8, 14:17, 18:7, 19:21, 21:13, 23:14, 23:17, 23:25, 24:1, 24:7, 34:1, 36:6, 36:7, 36:20, 37:5, 37:23, 38:24 ones [3] - 25:1, 29:6, 37:2 open [3] - 4:1, 7:23, 17:20 opine [2] - 18:11, 28:12 opining [2] - 18:6, 21:25 opinion [2] - 23:14, 23:20 opinions [14] - 14:20, 18:7, 19:6, 19:7, 19:8, 19:13, 20:7, 22:4, 23:10, 24:5, 25:17, 25:24, 26:13

opportunity [9] - 6:12,

7:10, 20:12, 20:17, 20:20, 24:24, 26:21, 27:14, 30:12 oppose [1] - 11:18 opposed [1] - 18:9 **oppositions** [1] - 5:19 oral [1] - 18:19 **Order** [1] - 34:8 order [8] - 6:14, 10:3, 10:4, 10:19, 10:20, 34:18, 34:25, 38:7 organizing [2] - 13:13, 13:19 original [1] - 24:5 otherwise [1] - 26:13 outside [1] - 36:23 overlook [1] - 10:15 overnight [1] - 17:17 own [2] - 32:10, 32:14

_

page [5] - 15:25, 16:10, 16:14, 16:23, 34:22 pages [7] - 13:1, 14:13, 14:25, 15:13, 16:9, 16:19, 16:20 Panel [1] - 21:5 **PAPANTONIO** [1] - 1:17 paper [3] - 12:12, 16:5, 21:1 papers [2] - 29:7, 29:17 **PARFITT** [28] - 1:16, 4:6, 9:20, 11:21, 12:19, 15:4, 15:14, 19:16, 19:18, 21:20, 22:10, 22:15, 22:19, 23:11, 26:1, 26:6, 26:19, 27:19, 27:22, 28:24, 29:8, 30:3, 32:13, 33:2, 34:20, 36:9, 36:16, Parfitt [5] - 4:6, 12:8, 21:9, 22:8, 30:8 part [2] - 11:4, 18:1 participate [1] - 38:3 particular [11] - 7:1, 10:19, 11:1, 23:14, 28:11, 28:13, 28:22, 32:18, 37:2, 37:5, 37:10 parties [1] - 34:16 past [3] - 18:23, 35:15, 36:20 patience [1] - 27:20 Pause [1] - 21:14

pause [2] - 13:3, 18:15 **PCPC** [1] - 2:18 **Pearson** [1] - 25:16 pending [5] - 9:25, 10:1, 34:11, 36:7, 37:10 PENNSYLVANIA [3] -1:20, 1:21, 2:6 people [6] - 25:11, 29:25, 31:11, 32:14, 36:23, 36:24 per [1] - 34:8 perhaps [2] - 12:1, 19:7 period [1] - 33:6 permits [1] - 27:14 person [3] - 18:10, 22:2, 32:19 Personal [2] - 2:17, 5:10 **Ph.D.s** [1] - 20:3 picking [1] - 32:3 picture [2] - 14:4, 25:25 pieces [1] - 14:20 **Pineda** [1] - 25:8 **Pisano** [3] - 9:13, 9:21, 10:24 **Pisano's** [1] - 10:11 **place** [1] - 38:2 plaintiffs [20] - 4:7, 4:9, 4:11, 4:13, 4:15, 4:17, 4:19, 13:1, 13:16, 17:23, 19:20, 19:22, 21:16, 25:6, 34:10, 34:14, 34:23, 35:1, 36:6, 36:8 Plaintiffs [5] - 2:7, 38:1, 38:3, 38:9, 38:12 plaintiffs' [7] - 9:16, 11:13, 11:24, 24:6, 25:21, 32:12 plan [3] - 10:23, 30:1, 33:19 **plausibility** [1] - 13:22 point [10] - 5:18, 7:1, 15:5, 16:7, 26:24, 30:7, 31:5, 31:19, 32:10, 34:4 polarized [1] - 24:11 **POPKIN** [1] - 2:13 position [8] - 11:13, 11:14, 11:22, 12:3, 17:24, 19:19, 35:3, 38:13 positioned [1] - 32:23 possible [1] - 15:24 posture [1] - 38:5 **POWDER** [1] - 1:5

practice [1] - 8:23 **PRACTICES** [1] - 1:5 prepare [1] - 16:24 presentation [1] - 15:11 preserved [1] - 28:15 pretty [2] - 12:21, 25:9 **printed** [1] - 36:10 privilege [1] - 11:14 problem [1] - 36:25 **procedural** [1] - 8:12 **Proceedings** [1] - 39:8 process [5] - 22:20, 26:22, 28:4, 29:15, 33:24 produce [1] - 19:23 **produced** [1] - 10:7 **producing** [1] - 15:7 product [1] - 11:15 **Products** [2] - 2:17, 5:10 **PRODUCTS** [1] - 1:5 professional [1] - 21:8 project [1] - 37:20 prong [1] - 19:21 proposed [1] - 38:7 **Proskauer** [1] - 5:1 **PROSKAUER** [1] - 2:12 provide [1] - 11:19 provided [1] - 9:22 provides [1] - 14:18 **PSC** [1] - 11:19 PTI [4] - 2:20, 5:13 published [3] - 12:12, 24:11, 24:13 **pure** [1] - 32:9 **PURSUANT** [1] - 3:9 pursuant [1] - 34:24 **pushing** [1] - 35:22 **put** [5] - 11:4, 16:14, 16:22, 24:3, 28:23

Q

qualification [3] - 25:12, 26:3, 28:7 qualifications [19] -17:23, 17:25, 18:1, 18:6, 18:25, 19:12, 19:21, 19:24, 20:8, 20:18, 20:24, 21:24, 24:18, 24:24, 25:5, 25:9, 26:4, 28:20, 28:21 qualified [8] - 19:12, 21:6, 21:18, 24:12, 25:21, 25:22, 25:23, 26:12 questions [2] - 7:21, 29:21 quick [3] - 10:13, 27:23, 31:15 quickly [1] - 13:11 quite [1] - 15:6

R

raised [3] - 21:11, 25:15,

raising [2] - 26:2, 26:4

rather [2] - 7:7, 31:10

randomly [1] - 7:7

raise [1] - 23:21

37:24

RE[1]-1:4 re [2] - 34:8, 34:14 re-filed [2] - 34:8, 34:14 reach [1] - 35:4 react [1] - 30:11 read [3] - 14:7, 21:7, 33:15 reader [1] - 15:23 reading [4] - 16:16, 16:24, 29:17, 31:8 real [2] - 17:2, 19:1 really [16] - 10:21, 14:4, 16:23, 16:25, 18:9, 19:3, 19:4, 23:4, 25:12, 26:16, 28:2, 29:23, 30:10, 32:17, 33:6, 35:5 reason [3] - 21:11, 21:12, 36:18 reasonable [1] - 35:17 **REATH** [1] - 2:8 recognize [1] - 27:8 recommendation [1] recommendations [2] -30:13, 34:2 reconcile [1] - 35:5 record [3] - 10:21, 12:15, 12:21 referred [1] - 6:15 regard [9] - 9:14, 9:25, 10:19, 15:16, 17:5, 20:2, 20:24, 27:15, 34:6 regarding [4] - 10:4, 10:7, 24:9, 24:18 regular [1] - 16:10 related [1] - 10:5

relates [1] - 24:8 relayed [1] - 12:3 relevant [2] - 15:17, 27:6 reliance [1] - 10:7 relying [1] - 29:7 remand [6] - 7:13, 7:20, 7:24, 8:9, 8:20, 34:11 remands [3] - 37:8, 37:13, 37:15 remember [1] - 38:20 remind [1] - 38:20 removal [2] - 7:11, 37:7 removals [2] - 6:21, 37:13 remove [2] - 6:20 removed [2] - 7:16, 7:19 removing [1] - 6:5 rendering [2] - 20:7 repeat [2] - 14:10, 16:16 **REPORTER** [2] - 1:25, reports [3] - 19:23, 21:7, representation [2] -12:15, 12:21 request [1] - 34:25 requests [1] - 11:18 require [2] - 16:5, 33:6 research [1] - 8:22 reserved [1] - 25:13 reserving [1] - 22:5 resignation [1] - 38:8 resolves [1] - 12:12 respond [1] - 31:9 rest [1] - 33:12 result [1] - 33:11 reviewing [1] - 36:8 **Ribbon** [1] - 21:5 **RICE** [1] - 1:18 **RICHARD** [1] - 2:6 Richard [1] - 4:16 rise [2] - 4:3, 39:7 road [1] - 14:18 role [1] - 11:24 **ROSE** [1] - 2:12 round [1] - 33:22 **Royston** [2] - 2:21, 5:14 **RPR** [1] - 1:24 **rule** [1] - 8:8 rules [1] - 16:11 ruling [2] - 8:15, 8:24 Russoniello [1] - 3:16 RUSSONIELLO [2] -

1:24, 3:17

S

S/Vincent [1] - 3:16 sadly [1] - 38:23 Saed [2] - 10:5, 10:19 **SALES** [1] - 1:5 **samples** [1] - 24:10 **satisfied** [1] - 9:23 satisfy [2] - 12:5, 26:14 saw [2] - 9:15, 11:13 schedule [3] - 29:2, 33:1, 33:13 schedules [1] - 30:1 scientists [1] - 21:8 searching [1] - 15:22 second [1] - 21:13 **SECTION** [1] - 3:9 section [1] - 15:16 **sections** [1] - 14:9 **SEDRAN** [1] - 1:20 See [1] - 27:2 see [8] - 8:18, 11:8, 23:19, 31:25, 32:21, 33:9, 34:4, 38:18 seem [1] - 21:16 send [4] - 12:8, 12:13, 17:11, 38:16 sending [1] - 36:3 sense [2] - 8:5, 26:10 sentencing [1] - 32:7 separate [3] - 14:12, 14:15, 15:18 serving [1] - 21:24 session [1] - 29:8 set [4] - 11:11, 13:14, 34:5, 35:18 **setting** [1] - 34:3 **SEYFARRTH** [1] - 2:15 **sharko** [1] - 4:20 **SHARKO** [23] - 2:9, 4:21, 4:25, 6:24, 12:7, 12:16, 13:7, 13:10, 13:16, 13:19, 14:1, 14:14, 14:16, 14:22, 14:25, 16:21, 21:5, 22:7, 25:7, 28:25, 33:21, 36:3, 38:15 **Sharko** [6] - 4:21, 6:4, 11:23, 12:3, 12:6, 36:1 **SHAW** [1] - 2:15

short [6] - 14:18, 34:12,

34:24, 35:1, 35:14, 35:18 **shot** [1] - 8:5 side [6] - 15:2, 18:3, 25:5, 25:20, 25:21, 32:12 **sides** [2] - 28:15, 30:12 similar [3] - 11:18, 15:6, 37:18 similarly [1] - 32:21 simple [1] - 17:7 **sit** [1] - 31:2 sitting [1] - 36:24 situation [1] - 35:25 **six** [2] - 14:16, 14:21 **SKADDEN** [1] - 2:10 **skip** [1] - 33:11 **SLATE** [1] - 2:10 slower [1] - 33:7 someone [6] - 7:8, 19:2, 19:3, 20:10, 23:4, 28:16 sometimes [1] - 22:21 **somewhere** [1] - 32:6 soon [1] - 36:17 **sort** [2] - 8:12, 30:12 speaking [1] - 10:18 specialty [1] - 18:7 specifically [1] - 10:24 **spend** [2] - 25:11, 26:10 spending [1] - 13:13 **spent** [1] - 18:24 **spring** [1] - 37:19 stage [1] - 17:23 **stand** [1] - 27:9 **standard** [1] - 20:19 standards [1] - 26:14 **standing** [1] - 6:14 start [1] - 30:21 starting [1] - 30:20 **STATE** [1] - 1:9 state [1] - 7:18 statement [1] - 11:15 **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 1:8 states [1] - 11:19 status [8] - 9:11, 11:11, 29:9, 33:12, 33:13, 34:6, 34:7, 34:22 **STATUS** [1] - 1:5 **statuses** [1] - 34:3 **Steering** [5] - 2:7, 38:1, 38:3, 38:9, 38:12 stellar [1] - 32:19

STENOGRAPHIC [1] -

3:11 steps [1] - 8:13 still [13] - 9:24, 10:1, 10:8, 10:17, 14:25, 32:19, 34:7, 34:9, 34:17, 36:8, 38:4, 38:24, 39:3 **STREET** [1] - 1:9 **strong** [1] - 21:9 studies [3] - 11:2, 11:20, 12:10 subject [2] - 14:24, 19:25 **submit** [5] - 31:4, 31:17, 31:19, 34:1, 38:18 submitting [2] - 34:18, 38:7 substantial [2] - 16:6, 34:10 **suffice** [1] - 12:19 suffices [1] - 12:20 sufficient [3] - 23:7, 35:20, 35:24 suggest [2] - 20:16, 30:15 suggested [1] - 17:22 suggesting [2] - 13:1, 22:16 **suggestion** [1] - 26:9 summer [1] - 37:20 support [1] - 10:22 **SUSAN** [1] - 2:9 Susan [1] - 4:21 system [1] - 38:22

Т

tabs [1] - 38:25

talc [1] - 24:14 talks [1] - 36:6 tedious [1] - 28:4 **TEM** [4] - 24:9, 24:13, 24:14, 24:18 ten [1] - 7:16 tends [1] - 33:7 terms [1] - 8:22 **Tersigni** [1] - 4:23 **TERSIGNI** [2] - 2:9, 7:4 tersigni [1] - 7:3 testify [1] - 29:6 testifying [1] - 20:10 testimony [3] - 19:24, 20:6, 23:7 testing [2] - 24:10, 24:14 thankfully [1] - 38:4

THE [6] - 1:1, 1:11, 3:9, 3:11, 4:3, 39:7 thematically [2] - 13:20, themes [1] - 14:3 themselves [1] - 24:5 thereafter [1] - 5:21 therefore [2] - 34:11, 35:9 thinking [2] - 20:5, 32:10 **THOMAS** [1] - 2:15 three [1] - 12:10 **Thursday** [1] - 10:3 **TINSLEY** [2] - 2:20, 5:12 Tinsley [1] - 5:13 **TISI** [2] - 1:17, 4:10 Tisi [2] - 4:11, 38:9 **TITLE** [1] - 3:9 titled [1] - 10:14 **TO** [2] - 3:9, 3:10 today [9] - 4:23, 7:21, 11:4, 12:15, 29:14, 29:25, 36:24, 37:22, 39:6 **Tom** [1] - 5:10 took [1] - 14:7 total [1] - 14:13 touch [2] - 9:6, 9:8 towards [1] - 37:4 toxicologist [1] - 23:16 toxicology [3] - 15:10, 15:19, 23:4 track [1] - 37:1 **TRANSCRIPT** [2] - 1:4, 3:10 TRANSCRIPTION [1] -3:11 transcripts [1] - 12:18 transfer [1] - 7:13 transferred [2] - 6:10, transmission [1] - 24:9 travel [1] - 31:2 tremendous [1] - 16:24 **TRENTON** [1] - 1:9 Trenton [2] - 6:10 trial [3] - 25:14, 26:12, 27:7 tried [1] - 23:2 trier [1] - 20:1 true [4] - 12:16, 15:14, 21:8, 28:15

try [5] - 15:24, 16:2, 16:8,

37:17, 37:18
trying [10] - 13:12,
15:23, 16:4, 16:17,
18:22, 22:10, 22:19,
26:21, 28:3, 33:9
TUCKER [1] - 2:19
Tuesday [1] - 17:12
turn [3] - 6:2, 9:11, 12:23
turned [1] - 9:19
turning [1] - 37:16
two [2] - 17:9, 33:9
type [1] - 25:2

U

U.S [2] - 1:25, 3:17 **U.S.C** [1] - 3:9 ultimately [2] - 23:19, 27:12 under [3] - 14:17, 16:11, 20:19 undoubtedly [1] - 35:13 **Union** [2] - 2:20, 5:13 unique [1] - 23:24 **UNITED** [2] - 1:1, 1:8 universe [1] - 35:6 unless [1] - 19:1 unlike [1] - 24:20 **up** [9] - 6:1, 6:7, 6:9, 14:2, 14:8, 14:23, 17:22, 26:24, 32:3 update [1] - 18:20 urge [2] - 24:23, 26:23 **USDJ** [1] - 1:11

٧

various [1] - 14:9 venue [2] - 5:17, 6:8 verse [1] - 28:14 view [1] - 20:9 VINCENT [2] - 1:24, 3:17 VIRGINIA [1] - 1:16

W

wait [3] - 11:7, 18:17, 25:19 waiting [1] - 9:16 waived [2] - 26:4, 26:5 waiving [1] - 11:18 wants [1] - 30:10 WASHINGTON [2] -2:11, 2:15 waste [7] - 16:19, 20:13, 20:15, 21:1, 25:1, 26:25, 27:3

wasted [1] - 27:17

wasteful [1] - 18:25

WEDINGER [1] - 2:16

week [7] - 5:23, 6:22, 7:10, 31:24, 32:1, 32:2

weeks [1] - 33:9

weight [5] - 22:12, 22:14, 22:16, 23:20, 24:21

Weinkowitz [1] - 4:15

WEINKOWITZ [2] - 1:21, 4:14

welcome [1] - 30:9

Whitehead [1] - 37:25

welcome [1] - 30:9 Whitehead [1] - 37:25 whiteheads's [1] - 38:8 whole [2] - 24:15, 31:24 wholesale [2] - 23:2, 23:9 WILLIAMS [5] - 2:12, 5:4,

30:5, 30:22, 31:13 **Williams** [3] - 4:25, 30:4, 30:6

wisely [1] - 21:3 wish [1] - 29:11 witnesses [3] - 21:8, 30:11, 31:19

WOLFSON [78] - 1:11, 4:4, 4:20, 4:24, 5:5, 5:15, 5:22, 6:25, 7:6,

8:1, 8:14, 9:1, 9:8, 9:24, 10:13, 11:3, 11:6, 11:10, 12:5, 12:14, 12:17, 12:20, 13:8, 13:15, 13:17, 13:23, 14:2,

14:15, 14:21, 14:23, 15:1, 15:12, 16:3, 16:22, 17:6, 17:9, 17:15, 17:17, 18:16, 19:17, 21:13,

21:15, 21:22, 22:8, 22:14, 22:18, 22:25, 23:12, 23:22, 25:4, 26:5,

26:8, 27:18, 27:20, 28:1, 29:1, 29:24, 30:4, 30:14,

30:19, 30:24, 31:16, 31:20, 31:23, 32:25, 33:5, 33:23, 34:14,

34:21, 35:9, 36:1, 36:5, 36:15, 37:2, 37:14, 38:13, 38:16, 39:3

works [3] - 13:9, 33:18, 33:19

world [1] - 36:23

write [1] - 25:16 written [2] - 11:12, 22:20 Wylie [3] - 24:1, 24:7, 24:11 Wylie's [1] - 24:17

Υ

year [1] - 19:23 yellow [1] - 39:3 yeoman's [1] - 38:10 YORK [1] - 2:13 yourself [1] - 29:10 yourselves [2] - 16:17